UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

GERRY B. LONG,

Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S

V.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

Defendant.

On February 3, 2009 plaintiff filed a complaint. (Ct. Rec. 1.) The parties have consented to proceed before a magistrate judge. (Ct. Rec. 6.) On March 12, 2009, defendant moved to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. (Ct. Rec. 7.) On March 31, 2009, plaintiff filed a response. (Ct. Rec. 13.)

Plaintiff's initial application for benefits apparently was denied on January 10, 2007, and her request for reconsideration denied on May 8, 2007. (Ct. Rec. 8 at 2.) Defendant points out that the notice of reconsideration stated plaintiff had no more than 60 days from the date of receipt to request a hearing before an ALJ, meaning shortly after July 8, 2007, depending on the exact date of receipt. (Id.) Plaintiff filed her request for hearing on July 21, 2008 - more than a year late. (Ct. Rec. 8 at 3.) On September 30, 2008, an ALJ found good cause for the late filed

request had not been established as defined by 20 C.F.R. § 404.911

1 and plaintiff's request for hearing was dismissed. (Ct. Rec. 8 at 2 3.) The court is persuaded that the statutory scheme expressly 3 allows judicial review only of a "final decision," and that has 4 5 not been presented to the court to review. See 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); Matlock v. Sullivan, 908 F.2d 492, 494 (9th Cir. 1990) 6 7 (Commissioner's ruling denying additional time to file a request 8 for hearing is not subject to judicial review). 9 After reviewing the record and the briefing by the parties, 10 the court GRANTS defendant's motion to dismiss (Ct. Rec. 7). As 11 noted in plaintiff's response (Ct. Rec. 13), she may file a new 12 claim. 13 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the motion (Ct. Rec. 7) is granted. 14 15 DATED this 1st day of April, 2009. 16 s/ James P. Hutton JAMES P. HUTTON 17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28